



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,788	09/18/2001	Nestor Kolcio	UPI 2-001	8181

7590

12/06/2002

Gerald L. Smith
Mueller and Smith, LPA
7700 Rivers Edge Drive
Columbus, OH 43235

EXAMINER

MORAN, KATHERINE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3765

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/954,788

Applicant(s)

KOLCIO ET AL.

Examiner

Katherine M Moran

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment of 9/24/02 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-14 are pending. In light of newly discovered prior art, new art rejections are detailed below.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the formation of ridges provided as a triangular pattern must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered. Figures 1-4 show diamond-shaped ridges.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3765

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchinson-Mapa (Hutchinson, France, 2,448,307-translation enclosed) in view of Daum et al. (Daum, U.S. 2002/0075232). Hutchinson '307 discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Hutchinson teaches method steps inherent in the structure of a rubber, tight-fitting, and insulative electricians' glove 1 with a non-conductive, adhesively-retained flock lining on at least a palm and back interior and the initial joint glove regions, for accessing low-voltage electrical components. The glove includes roughened external surfaces at the palm and fingertip regions 3,4 (Figs.1,2) and ridges (pg.4, lines 11-15). Page 2, lines 19-21 recite that the glove is capable of providing protection under test voltages of at least 5000 volts. However, Hutchinson does not teach periodically removing the glove from the hand to cool and remove moisture from the hand and glove and thereafter replacing the glove on the hand. Daum '232 teaches a rubber glove which produces a build up of sweat inside the glove (pg.1, col.1, paragraph 6). As a result, it is common for a user to have to take a rest from using the glove after only several minutes. "Taking a rest" implies a brief respite from wearing the glove, including removing the glove and thereafter replacing the glove upon the hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the step of periodically removing the glove from the gloved hand to cool and remove moisture from the hand and glove and thereafter replacing the glove upon the hand, because it is well known that rubber gloves cause a build up of sweat on a glove's interior, thus removing the glove and replacing it thereafter, temporary cools the user's hand. Regarding claims 5 and 12, Hutchinson teaches the ridges may be replaced by any suitable raised projections. Further, the specification does not provide criticality for the triangular ridged pattern. As such, this is an obvious design choice which could

Art Unit: 3765

have been arrived at through routine experimentation. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Hutchinson's glove with a formation of ridges provided as a triangular pattern because this pattern is known to provide anti-slip properties to the glove.

5. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchinson '307 and Daum '232 and further in view of Barnett (U.S. 4,536,890). Hutchinson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Hutchinson does not teach the step of spraying a non-conductive adhesive flock through the hand access opening of the glove. Barnett '890 teaches a glove with an adhesive born flock layer 20 which is applied by spraying. This is a common method employed to quickly and cleanly provide a glove with an insulative layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to spray a flock layer in the glove of Hutchinson because this is a time-efficient method of imparting lining into the glove.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 9/24/02 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-14 based upon Barnett '890 and Ganz '899 as set forth in the last Office action because: while Applicant's professional experience and education in the field of the invention as outlined in Exhibits A and B, is duly noted, the exhibits do not obviate the prior art rejections cited above. Regarding pg.1, number 9 of the declaration where Applicant contends

Art Unit: 3765

that Barnett does not describe the utilization of a non-conductive adhesively retained flock, Barnett's cotton flock is inherently non-conductive and is adhesively retained as recited in col.3, lines 46-51. Applicant's contention that the intended function of Barnett's flock differs from the intended function of the flock of the present application is irrelevant since the flock structure is the same in both cases. It is believed that the other points raised by the declaration have been obviated by the newly discovered art recited above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Examiner Katherine Moran at (703) 305-0452. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Calvert, may be reached at (703) 305-1025. The official fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9302. The after final fax number for this organization where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9303.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist at (703) 308-1148.

Kmm

December 5, 2002

*Katherine
Moran
AU 3765*